

*From the Desk of ...*



**Congressman Dan Lungren**  
*California*

March 23, 2007

[Unsubscribe](#)

[Update My Profile](#)

[Website](#) - [Biography](#) - [Lungren in the News](#) - [About the Third District](#) - [Contact](#)

Just a reminder that my next  
**Town Hall Meeting**  
is coming up!

**Monday, June 4**  
**7:00pm-8:30pm**

Rancho Cordova City Hall  
American River Room  
2729 Prospect Park Drive  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

I look forward to hearing your thoughts on issues affecting  
our 3rd Congressional District.

\* \* \* \* \*

If you would like to stay informed about federal legislation  
introduced in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, as well as local issues that  
may interest you, please take a moment to subscribe to my  
monthly e-newsletter at <http://lungren.house.gov/>.

\* \* \* \* \*

My "Washington Wrap-up" is available weekly in an audio format  
at <http://lungren.house.gov/podcasts.shtml>. You can listen  
online, download the files on your computer, or load them onto  
your i-pod via i-tunes. Perfect for commuters and those who  
want to keep up with the latest happenings in Washington, DC.

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Friend,

I would like to share with you some recent legislative developments in Washington, D.C.

The most important piece of legislation coming out of the Capitol this week has to do with the  
supplemental funding resolution for the war in Iraq and the global war on terror. As you may  
know, this supplemental bill is supposed to be of an emergency nature.

The President asked for \$99 billion additional funds in this supplemental appropriation. He also asked for \$3.4 billion for hurricane relief – to continue with the relief programs we have already established for victims of the latest hurricanes to hit our country.

So what did the Congress do?

Well, on a partisan vote, it gave us (instead of \$103 billion) \$124 billion. I have to say, this is both cynical and unconstitutional.

Why do I say cynical? Because that additional \$20 plus billion was in categories that are not of an emergency nature. This was done in an effort to try to obtain votes so that the overwhelming amount of money carrying restrictions against the President's plan in Iraq would actually be passed. I realize that we have a number of issues involving the war in Iraq, but I think they ought to be debated up front, in their entirety, within a Constitutional context. What I mean by that is that the Constitution clearly states that the President holds the Commander in Chief power. Thus, once we give him the authority to prosecute a war, he is the one responsible for conducting that war. If, in fact, the Congress disagrees with how the President is prosecuting the war, our recourse under the Constitution is to cut off funds.

Congress has the power of the purse.

That is the tension that exists within the Constitution. Therefore, if Members really believe that what we are doing in Iraq is misguided, the constitutionally responsible thing for us to do would be to consider a resolution to cut off funding for the war. Nevertheless, what we have heard from the Democratic leadership – from Jack Murtha, from Nancy Pelosi and others – is that they know they do not have the votes for passage.

Instead, it appears they are going to try to do by indirection what they cannot do with direction, and our Constitution does not allow that. What they are trying to do is put restrictions on the President's authority that fall under the rubric of spending but which do not really go to the question of cutting off spending.

So what does that do?

First, it sends a wrong message to our troops in the field. It tells them that despite the fact that General Petraeus, our new military commander on the ground in Iraq, was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate, those in Congress do not support his mission – a mission that he helped develop, a mission that he put his stamp on, a mission he has told our troops he believes can be victorious.

Second, it sends a message to the Iraqi people that they cannot trust our ability to continue in the tough fight so that we can transfer to them the responsibility for their own security.

Third, it sends a very direct message to the enemy, that in fact while we say we are implementing a new, targeted effort – the new tactics, new strategy that General Petraeus is in charge of – we do not believe it is actually going to work. It tells our enemies that if you just wait long enough, we are going to leave.

All of those things undercut the possibility that we can succeed in Iraq.

The emergency supplemental is a cynical attempt by the Democratic leadership to spend taxpayers' money in order to influence votes that have nothing to do with the war. Such "pork" includes votes in the area of agriculture, votes in the area of funding for children's health, votes on the minimum wage, votes in miscellaneous funding. This was done solely to attract votes from people who otherwise might not vote for this because they do not believe we ought to have these restrictions.

This policy sends a vote of no confidence to our troops, to our allies, and it sends the wrong signal to our enemies.

Those who believe we are wrong ought to put their money where their mouth is and do what we are required to do under the Constitution. In any event, I would tell you very honestly that if we had the vote to cut off funding for our troops, I would oppose such action. But at least I would stand up and engage in a debate over the issue.

The most important issue facing this Congress at this time is how to best support our men and women in uniform who are fighting on our behalf around the world.

This debate really comes down to whether we believe that Congress is better able to direct the war in Iraq than the generals of the armed forces on the ground.

And if we, the Congress, do believe that, then we had better change the Constitution.

Sincerely,



Daniel E. Lungren  
Member of Congress

\*\*\*\*\*

### E-MAIL UPDATES

**Yes, please periodically send me e-mail updates.\***

[Click Here](#)

\*By subscribing to my e-mail updates, you are authorizing me to send regular e-mail updates from my office to your e-mail account.

### Please Feel Free to Tell a Friend

E-mail:

E-mail:

E-mail:

[Send](#)

### Contact Information

**Washington Office: 2262 Rayburn HOB - Washington, DC 20515**

**Phone: (202) 225-5716 - Fax: (202) 226-1298**

**District Office: 2339 Gold Meadow Way, Suite 202 - Gold River, CA 95670**

**Phone: (916) 859-9906 - Fax: (916) 859-9976**

[Update My Profile](#) - [Unsubscribe](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)